

(Liebm.) R.M. Tryon & Stolze and *B. lehmannii* Hieron. Neither of these has a stoloniferous rhizome. Both species also grow only in forested areas below 3500 m.

In conclusion, both *B. andinum* and *B. penna-marina* ssp. *boliviana* have been collected in Peru. Records for the latter are based on a single collection made during the nineteenth century, and for the former from three collections made during the last 60 years.

Thanks to Harald Komposch for the translation of German comments of Mettenius. I also thank David B. Lellinger, Robbin C. Moran, Alan R. Smith, and Kenneth R. Young for reviews and comments of the manuscript. Thanks also to Alan R. Smith, Tyana Wachter, and Brigitte Zimmer for providing me with photocopies of the studied taxa.—BLANCA LEÓN, Museo de Historia Natural, Av. Arenales 1256, Apartado 14-0434, Lima-14, Peru, and Botany Department, Field Museum, Chicago, IL 60605-2496.

***Salvinia adnata* Desv. Versus *S. molesta* D.S. Mitch.**—The name *Salvinia molesta* D.S. Mitch. (Brit. Fern Gaz. 10:251–252. 1972) has been widely used for an aquatic fern native to the New World tropics but introduced and weedy in the Old World tropics. Recently, de la Sota (Darwiniana 33:309–313. 1995) proposed replacing this name with an earlier one, *S. adnata* Desv. (*Prodromus*, 177. 1827). The subject of this note is our differing interpretation from that of de la Sota concerning the provenance of the type of *S. adnata* and whether it can be proven conspecific with *S. molesta*.

The name *S. adnata* is based on a specimen that, according to its label, was collected on Réunion (“*Habitat in insula Borboniae*”). This locality was accepted by de la Sota (1995); however, it conflicts with what is known about the plant’s weediness, geographic distribution, and insect enemies.

Evidence from several sources indicates that *S. molesta* is native to southern Brazil (Forno, Aquat. Bot. 17:71–83. 1983; Mitchell, Brit. Fern Gaz. 10:251–252. 1972). It is never weedy in South America and has several insect herbivores that feed exclusively upon it. In contrast, in the Old World it is an aggressive weed, in some cases carpeting thousands of hectares of water, and has no native insect enemies that attack it (Thomas and Room, Nature 320: 581–584. 1986). The species was first recorded from the Old World (India) in 1939. Presumably, had it been native, it would have been collected there before that date. Moreover, if it had been native to the Old World, why would it have become a weed only in the 1950s and not before? All of these observations argue that the plant is native to the New World, not the Old World. Why, then, is the type of *S. adnata*, which de la Sota claims is conspecific with *S. molesta*, reportedly from Réunion?

The most likely explanation is a label error. Christensen first pointed this out in his work on the pteridophytes of Madagascar (*Dansk. Bot. Ark.* 7:203. 1932) and annotated the type of *S. adnata* accordingly with “*patria certe erronea*.” In the original description, Desvaux wrote “*Hab. in aquosis insularum*

Africae orientali" which is less specific than Réunion, perhaps further indicating his uncertainty about the provenance of the type. Christensen also pointed out that Desvaux queried with a "?" the localities of several other of his type specimens reportedly from Africa, Madagascar, and the Mascarenes, and that in several cases these localities were untrustworthy. It is highly unlikely that *S. adnata* would be known today natively only from southern Brazil and have a type from Réunion, where it does not occur (Baker, 1877, *Flora of Mauritius and the Seychelles*). A more likely explanation is that the type of *S. adnata* came from southern Brazil and a label mix-up occurred or that Desvaux himself guessed wrongly about the provenance of the specimen. Thus, the type should be cited as coming from Brazil, not Réunion.

Provenance aside (and more importantly), it cannot be proven that the type of *S. adnata* is the same as *S. molesta*. De la Sota did not discuss the characteristics he used to equate the type of *S. adnata* with *S. molesta*. The type of *S. adnata* (pictured by de la Sota, *Darwiniana* 33:309–313, 1995, Fig. 3) is vegetative, and therefore cannot be distinguished from another closely related species that also grows in southern Brazil: *S. biloba* Raddi (Forno, *Aquat. Bot.* 17:71–83, 1983). As far as we know, it is impossible to distinguish specimens of *S. biloba* from *S. adnata* if the plants lack fertile axes bearing sporocarps. Therefore, we cannot be certain whether *S. adnata* is the same as *S. molesta* or *S. biloba*.

For these reasons, *S. adnata* should be treated as a name of uncertain application. The name *S. molesta*, which is well-established in the literature, should continue to be used for this economically important, highly weedy, and widely known fern.—ROBBIN C. MORAN, New York Botanical Garden, Bronx, NY 10458-5126; ALAN R. SMITH, University Herbarium, University of California at Berkeley, 1001 Valley Life Science Bldg., #2465, Berkeley, CA 94720-2465.